



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,064	08/20/2003	Shingo Hane	62758-053	4353

7590 11/27/2006

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,064

Applicant(s)

HANE ET AL.

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/20/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown) US Patent 6,671,805.

As per claim 1:

Brown teaches an electronic document management system, comprising:

a data creation device for creating data by dividing an electronic document into two or more partial documents having an arbitrary or fixed length; (col. 8, lines 35-47; col. 15, lines 17-20)

a signature device for generating a plurality of items of information for verifying the validity of each of the partial documents and affixing a digital signature to an aggregate of the generated items of information for verifying the validity of the partial documents; (col. 8, line 57-col. 9, lines 30; col. 13, line 41-col. 14, line 63)

Art Unit: 2137

a masking device for masking, by deleting or modifying, the electronic document targeted for a digital signature on an individual partial document basis; (col. 12, lines 56-67; col. 13, lines 12-40) and

a verification device for verifying the validity of the masked electronic document. (col. 22, line 9-col. 23, line 45)

As per claim 2:

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses wherein the verification device confirms the validity of the whole electronic document by verifying the aggregate of the information for confirming the validity of the partial documents; and confirms the validity of the partial documents of the electronic document targeted for verification by verifying the information for confirming the validity of each of the partial documents, and determines whether the electronic document is partially deleted or modified. (col. 22, line 9-col. 23, line 45)

As per claim 4:

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses wherein the data creation device divides the electronic document by adding a delimiter to the beginning and/or end of the partial documents. (col. 8, lines 35-47; col. 15, lines 17-20)

As per claim 5:

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses wherein the electronic document is a document created with a markup language, wherein the partial documents are markup units for the document created

Art Unit: 2137

with the markup language, and wherein the delimiter is a tag for the markup language.

(col. 8, lines 35-47; col. 15, lines 17-20)

As per claim 6:

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses wherein the information for confirming the validity of the partial documents is a hash value which is generated with a hash function for the partial documents. (col. 22, line 9-col. 23, line 45)

As per claim 7:

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses wherein the information for confirming the validity of the partial documents is a digital signature for the partial documents. (col. 22, line 9-col. 23, line 45)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown) US Patent 6,671,805 in view of Lee et al. (hereinafter Lee) US Publication 2003/0145197.

Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brown further discloses an authorization failure that notifies a signer and/or the signer's employer, bank, or the like if a signature is not successfully verified. (col. 24, line 51-col. 25, line 4) Brown does not explicitly disclose wherein the verification device displays the result of the verification on a display unit for the purpose of notifying a verifier whether the electronic document is partially deleted or modified while assuring the validity of the whole electronic document. Lee in analogous art, however discloses a verification device displays the result of the verification on a display unit for the purpose of notifying a verifier whether the electronic document is partially deleted or modified while assuring the validity of the whole electronic document. (page 8, paragraph 53) It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Brown with Lee in order to provide the verification result to the user by utilizing web documents.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shewaye Gelagay


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER